Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)	
	10/037,485	MASTROMATTE	MASTROMATTEO, UBALDO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	· <u>-</u>	
	Hung K. Vu	2811		
All Participants:	Status of Application	Status of Application:		
(1) <u>Hung K. Vu</u> .	(3)			
(2) <u>Harold H. Bennett II</u> .	(4)			
Date of Interview: 16 April 2004	Time: <u>3:00</u>			
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	plicant's representative)		,	
Part I.				
Rejection(s) discussed:				
Claims discussed: 1-12, 30-40 Prior art documents discussed:				
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GE See Continuation Sheet	NERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:		
Part III.				
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separal directly resulted in the allowance of the application. of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separal did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sumit 	The examiner will provide a ate record of the substance of	written summary of the interview, since	ne substance	
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applie	cant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appr	opriate)	

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-413B)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner points out that claim 1 recites the limitations of semiconductor regions and isolation regions in a first wafer of semiconductor material. However, Figure 11 and the related description of page 9 of the specification show semiconductor regions (56) and isolation regions (55) on, not in, a first wafer (54) of semiconductor material. Therefore, claim 1 is not read on the elected embodiment of Figure 11. Attorney Bennett argues that because Examiner issued the Ex Parte Quayle action, he did not have opportunity to respond..